

tribal land. They must rescind their permit that was issued without full understanding of potential risk and must stop construction.

NATIONAL ADOPTION DAY

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, Saturday is National Adoption Day. It is an annual celebration of the thousands of new adoptions that take place every year. It is also an opportunity to raise awareness of the thousands of children who are still in foster care in need of permanent homes.

Since National Adoption Day was started 16 years ago, several children advocacy groups, including the Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institute, have worked with foster care agencies and courts in all 50 States to finalize more than 40,000 adoptions to take place on that day. This is amazing work that helps bring wonderful additions to selfless, committed families. It is great to see so many children finding new beginnings through adoption, but it is also important to remember those who are still in need of permanent homes.

There are more than 100,000 children who are waiting for an adoptive family in foster care, and, on average, they wait nearly 3 years to be adopted. Every child deserves to grow up in a loving family and a safe and open-hearted home.

Mr. Speaker, adoption is a joyous occasion for thousands of children and families, and National Adoption Day is a reminder of how to create more of these powerful life-changing experiences.

□ 1215

TIME TO LOOK AHEAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CURBELO of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a pleasure to be in this somewhat hallowed Hall.

The election is behind us. It is time to look ahead. But as everyone who studies history knows, those who fail to learn from history are destined to repeat it. And so we go.

We continue too often to repeat the mistakes of the past, but it looks like the American people wanted a change—quite a change—and I know there are calls that we get rid of the electoral college, but when one looks at the map of the United States district-by-district within the States that voted for the different parties, candidates, one sees very clearly that you have the big cities that were voting Democrat and the 90 percent or so of the rest of the

country voted Republican. It really is amazing to see just how distinctive that has become.

South Texas is not highly populated, but is blue. Otherwise, most of the country that voted Democrat is just large cities, many of which are failing, many of which have become sanctuary cities, many of which have high crime rates. So I was a bit encouraged to continue to hear statements made by President-elect Trump.

There is an article today—with regard to the government, that is—from The Washington Examiner by Paul Bedard: “\$42 billion in Obama regulations are on Trump’s chopping block. Nearly 50 massive and costly regulations that cost Americans and businesses 53 million more hours filing paperwork and that have already put a \$42 billion hit on the U.S. economy are being teed up for President-elect Trump to cut in his first weeks in office.”

And you go through and you look and top on the list are Head Start performance standards. Really, education was doing pretty well in my home State. Back before President Carter created the Department of Education, between 70 and 75 percent of all employees in the education system in Texas were teachers; but when you create this big bureaucracy called the Department of Education, it means for every cubicle we put here in Washington, D.C., just down the street here at the Department of Education, every State has to hire additional people to work in cubicles. But some States are more generous than others. Some have very nice offices.

But then, for every bureaucrat you put in a State capital office that is going to respond to the bureaucrats in the Department of Education here, you have to have additional clerical help, administrative help in each individual school district. That is people that could be helping our children. That is people that could be making students brighter than any other students.

But what are they doing?

They are filling out mountains of paperwork to send to the State capital so they can fill out mountains of paperwork and send it to the Department of Education.

To see that just one item within the Department of Education could cut \$42 billion in Obama regulations is incredible. At a time when we have skyrocketed over the last 7-plus years from \$11 billion in debt to \$20 billion in debt, it is just incredible. Incredible. Yet, there is so much we are costing America.

I am excited about the coming year because the kind of things that are listed here is just government overregulation; government bureaucrats from here overregulating. I know most people are proud when they set new all-time records, which this administration did in new regulations for the years with regard to pages of regulations. I think it seems like the Bush

administration may have hit 74,000 pages or so one year, but that didn’t create a problem for the Obama administration. They have blown right past 74,000 pages of regulations.

How is anyone in business in the United States supposed to stay in business if they have to go through 74,000 pages of new regulations in addition to the old regulations that may still be in effect?

It is incredible. Like the Heritage Foundation has pointed out, more persons are committing three or four Federal crimes every day because we don’t know what all the regulations are.

I am very encouraged as we go into the new year that one of the things we want to accomplish—and Chairman GOODLATTE in the Judiciary Committee has it on his list of things to get done—is really address the overcriminalization that has occurred over all these years. You slap a prison sentence on some vague crime or on some vague statute that says it is a crime if you violate any of the laws or regulations, and then bureaucrats sit around and dream up things that annoy them, and all of a sudden somebody can be going to prison for things none of us knew were crimes.

One guy did know that a substance he was sending through the mail, since he was a scientist, required ground only. So he checked the box “ground only.” He didn’t know that some bureaucrat had passed or created a regulation that said not only do you check the box, you have to put a little ticker with an airplane with a red line through it. And if you don’t do that, you get arrested, drug to Alaska, where he was sending it—he didn’t even live there, didn’t have friends—and held up there for 18 months or so, I think. It is incredible. We have got to do right by the American people.

I have been blessed to be able to travel all over the country in the past year or so. And everywhere I go, it just seems like the economy is ready to take off. If we can just get this massive, oppressive bureaucracy in Washington off of the neck of the economy, people will start having jobs again.

I know some people are worried about the wall or fence, but as you see people out of work—some of them being paid, apparently, to riot or picket, the things they do. I remember one picketer out here on The Mall back during the shutdown said he was getting \$15 an hour from Democratic sources to picket out there at the World War II Monument. Some of them get paid. Maybe that is all the work they can find.

Well, how great would it be to take that picket sign out of their hand and say: My friend, we have productive work for you. You can help your country, you can help yourself by cutting down on potential terrorism coming across other southern border, by cutting down on people coming into the country illegally and getting welfare, food stamps, all these benefits that

other Americans will have to pay for those who are here illegally. You can take this trowel, take this mortar, and go over to that brick pile by our border and just start helping us build the wall. We will pay you to do that.

I don't know, if they get \$15 an hour to come picket in Washington, they may want \$16 or \$17 to help build the wall or the fence down on our border, but we have certainly got plenty of people that can work, because you see them in the streets all over the country. They have come out of their safe spaces where their feelings were hurt because things didn't go like they wanted and nobody has told them, as my late mother, brilliant as she was, used to say: Well, nothing is fair, and the quicker you get used to it, the better off you will be.

I would contend—and she would roll her eyes—yeah, but we can take care of our own little part to make it more fair. And that is what we are supposed to do. If things are not fair, then you get involved in government and you try to fix it.

That is why I came to Washington. I saw that things weren't fair up here, that the Federal Government was luring people away from their God-given potential. I kept having young women come before me as a felony judge in Texas for welfare fraud. And the cases were nearly identical. They pour out their hearts, lay out their situation. They were bored with high school and somebody said: Well, the Federal Government will send you a check if you just drop out and have a baby. Then they find out after they have the child: I can't really live on this little bit. This is not enough to live on. So they have another child and another child. These are just the ones that came to my court, but I would imagine that there are other situations just like this all over the country.

When I was teaching a joint sociology class at a predominantly African American school back in Tyler, Texas—a great school that has done so much good for so many—Texas College—but there were women there probably in their late twenties, and when we started talking about this, I was blown away with the intellectual level of these women and their commitment that we have to fix our Federal system that is destroying people and their potential.

One lady in her older twenties, God bless her, she came back. She decided: I have had kids. I have been in debt. I am going to improve myself. I mean, that is the American Dream. That is what we hope for. She said, You have got to put that work requirement in and you have got to make it more forceful.

Another lady said: You have got to put drug tests on there. Man, I was spending my money I was getting from the government not so much for my kid, but for my drugs. You need to have a drug test. Don't just give people money like that. You are ruining them.

I am hearing people across the country that have figured out this massive welfare state that was created with the best of intentions in the mid-sixties has done more to pull people away from their God-given potential and put them into ruts or ditches from which they couldn't get out of.

Yet, that is not supposed to ever be the role of government, whether you look to Biblical scripture, like I do. In Romans 13, the government is supposed to be an encourager of good conduct, help people, encourage them, direct them to reach their potential. Don't lure them away from their potential and make them beholden to this big master government. Encourage them. We need a safety net here and there, but encourage them. The sky is the limit and get out of the way.

Like Edison said, I didn't fail however many hundreds of thousands of times. I tried to find the filament that would make a light bulb work. He didn't fail all those times. He just found that many ways that would not work in a light bulb, then he found the one that would. You encourage people to try. Failure shouldn't necessarily be a trophy, but it ought to get a slap on the back. Come on, you can keep going. You can do it.

□ 1230

The government should not lure people away from trying. It was never intended to be anything but a safety net so you could rebound and get back on your feet. Instead, we take people off their feet and lead them away from being productive in the country for themselves.

I have mentioned this before, but I, as a freshman here in Congress, 12 years ago, went to a conference at Harvard. One of the speakers, the dean there—I was surprised, dean at Harvard Business School—had these charts, and he showed single mothers' income in the United States, when adjusted for inflation, from the creation of welfare until welfare reform, from the mid-sixties to mid-nineties when Newt Gingrich and Republicans took the Congress in January 1995, did welfare reform. I know President Clinton now takes credit for it, but he vetoed it. It wasn't until they had enough votes, basically, to override his veto that they finally got him on board, and now he likes to take credit for it. It was the Republicans that drove them there.

He likes to take credit for the balanced budget. He vetoed numerous things that would have made it balance, and once they had the votes that would override his veto, he would sign them, and we got to a balanced budget back in the late nineties.

But that is what we are going to have to do come January, and we can't give away the farm when we come back. I am encouraged today to hear our Speaker and leader talking about what we are going to be doing. And wow, isn't it wonderful that now that Donald Trump is the President-elect, Repub-

lican leadership is now saying: You know what we are going to do is we need to take care of the military so we don't suffer there any more than we already have for 8 years. But maybe get that done for the rest of the year and then, basically, have a continuing resolution that gets us out maybe to March so that we can come in with the Congress the people of the United States have said they now want making the decisions. That makes sense. They have spoken: Let's let that Congress make the big calls then with the new President when he comes in in January.

What is so great about that is some of us were talking about that back in September, and then we were told no, no; we have got to do it for the whole year, and we are going to have to add this and that. We can't just go to March because that will destroy the military. We have got to do everything for the whole year.

A new President is elected named Trump, and all of a sudden, hey, let's just go to March. Sounds great to me. That sounds like a good idea. I would have been willing to do that in September as we were talking about then. It wasn't acceptable then. I am glad it is acceptable now for a new Congress.

And when we talk about problems in the United States, our military has been deflated back to a pre-World War II position. We were not a superpower after World War I. We weren't the main defender of truth, justice, freedom.

But as you travel around the world, like I have mentioned, in Africa, where Africans were saying, you know: We were so excited when you elected your first Black President, but since he has been in office, we have seen America get weaker and weaker. And you have got to go back to Washington and tell those people there to stop getting weaker.

This was a group of African Christians. They said, you know: We all know where we are going when we die, but our only chance for peace in this life is if America is strong.

Now, the world, so many countries like to deride us and take verbal shots. Some take other kinds of shots. But some like to fly planes closely, mocking our ships, and I am looking forward to that happening under President Trump. I suspect if it happens, it probably won't happen more than once, and they will learn not to mess with us.

So it will be nice to have a reputation: You are not going to continue to bully the world. While this administration likes to talk about bullies in elementary school and send—they like to see little kids who were bullies in elementary school arrested, threatened.

Well, I was a little bitty kid, and one of my best friends from elementary school was here yesterday. We were talking about old times. He and I were the same little bitty runt size, so we got picked on a lot. But we didn't want anybody to come get arrested, and we figured out ways that we made sure the biggest bully never bothered us again.

But to give an elementary school kid an arrest, drag them in for being a bully? I mean, kids have to grow up, and that is why we are called adults. We are supposed to have learned and supposed to understand kids will be kids.

Foolishness can be found in the heart of a child. But some say maybe Proverbs is encouraging a crime when it says: but the rod can drive it far from them. Nobody wants a child to be abused, but I know most of my friends in school, we got paddled at one time or another.

I had friends I played football with, whether it was freshman year, junior varsity, or varsity, that if they had not been paddled, I had no doubt they were headed for prison. But they had coaches that cared about them. They didn't just want to win as coaches. They wanted these kids to be good adults, so they used discipline. We had some troubled folks after high school, but the coaches saved a lot of kids by caring.

I mentioned before that I had some coaches that I loved, and they are more like friends, even though they were adults. My favorite year, my favorite coach was Willie Williams.

It was interesting, you know. Conservatives are called bigots all the time. First time I mentioned that here in Washington, that my favorite high school coach was—happened to be Black, and I never noticed any racial problems on that team because he was rough on all of us. He was a very smart man, too, good coach.

I love Coach Williams, and it was my great honor to be invited back to my hometown a couple of weeks ago when Mount Pleasant was playing Greenville. Greenville is a lot bigger city. Mount Pleasant had won two games.

Coach Williams is now retired, but I was told Coach Williams was up in the press box, that he did some of the calling color for the games. There were so many thrills there, getting to know the kids and being with the team on the sideline and rejoicing at good plays. But they won. Apparently, it was the best game they played. Those kids have a lot of potential they didn't realize, but they gave me the game ball.

Just so many things that thrilled me there, my hometown where I grew up, Mount Pleasant, but nothing more than when I got to hug Coach Williams up there at the press box. That was special.

Although he is substantially older now and gray—and, fortunately, his memory has not waned at all—Coach Williams remarked: You had a great team, but it wasn't because you had good talent—that's how I know his memory had not failed him—but you guys played so well together. You gave it everything. You played well together, and that is how you were a winning team.

I really had hopes that that is what would happen. I didn't support Barack Obama for President, but I really had hopes that we would be brought to-

gether as never before, just the way Coach Williams brought us together on that football team.

I thought it was rather ironic, one of the liberal press immediately did a story on my favorite basketball coach in high school. Apparently, they figured, since they are liberal, well, he is Black, so I guess Blacks are only good at basketball, so he must have been his basketball coach. He was my football coach, JV football coach before I went to varsity the next year. But, ironic, who is the more bigoted, I wonder. But, nonetheless, it wasn't like our team under Coach Williams. We have become a very divided country.

In this article from FOX News, Dakota Wood, just this week, points out our military is no longer large enough, strong enough, or modern enough to keep America safe, and that is why China is making moves in the South Sea. It is why Russia is rattling sabers and looking around them if they should possibly move before a more authoritative President, a more decisive President like President-elect Trump, comes into office. So I think the world is scared for the next couple of months.

Are these countries like Iran, Russia, China, are they going to try to make a move in the next 2 months because they know this President may send some rockets or something, may send a SEAL team, but they are not going to really be final-type activities to really send a message. So we will see. Hopefully, the threat of President Trump coming in January will be sufficient to keep Iran from trying to make a move on Mecca, Russia from trying to make a move on Georgia, Ukraine, Crimea—Crimea being part of Ukraine, of course, should be—but remains to be seen.

And then after all of the trauma that has been created by—I just can't call it the Affordable Care Act because it is so costly. But the President was proud that it was called ObamaCare initially, and so that is a better term. People know what it means immediately, know what we are talking about.

But this article from the Washington Free Beacon, Ali Meyer, says one-third of adults went without health care due to expensive costs. We were doing so much better. Most of the people I hear from in my district, over 700,000 people, were doing a lot better under—before ObamaCare kicked in. They are not going to be able to afford health care next year. That was one of the reasons that 90 percent of the geographical U.S. voted to change parties as President because they have seen the suffering they have had because their health care has suffered.

This article says one-third of adults in the U.S. went without recommended health care due to expensive costs, according to a Commonwealth Fund survey. The survey actually was conducted in 11 countries—the U.S., Australia, Canada, France, Germany, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, the United King-

dom—and this was all within this year, from March to June of this year, and that is what we find. A third of Americans, now that we have been under ObamaCare for 6 years, have really felt the pinch, and some have felt it to their demise or detriment.

Another article from Elizabeth Harrington, ObamaCare premiums are to increase 27 percent. It points out that a new study obtained by the Washington Free Beacon shows premium increases under ObamaCare will actually be higher than the Federal Government's projections, and it points out they will increase by 27 percent, according to the American Action Forum.

□ 1245

It points out that the Department of Health and Human Services announced last month that premiums would increase an average of 22 percent in 2017. But premiums will actually increase as much as 145 percent in some States.

"The American Action Forum found that the average increase is likely to be higher than predicted because the agency did not factor in that nearly half of ObamaCare plans no longer exist, forcing enrollees to switch to costlier plans," if they have them at all.

Then we have this from Lana Shadwick: "DHS Sued for Ignoring Environmental Effects of Mass Immigration." There is so much damage that has come from our border not being secured. I heard one of my friends across the aisle say just this week in the press that our southern border is secure and that Mr. Trump should come down and see it. Mr. Trump has come down and seen it, and I have been down there many times.

To be on the border as I was just in the last month, recent months, out there on the Rio Grande, it is pretty wide, and yet that is still where so many thousands and thousands and thousands cross. At 2, 3 in the morning, we were on a Texas Department of Public Safety boat because Texas, though they are not authorized by the Supreme Court to defend our borders, they are authorized under the Texas Constitution and required to protect our State. They spent millions of dollars. They have these fantastic boats. We had night vision on the boat. They have thermotechnology. They could see where people were hiding and what they were hiding behind. They have other technology. When they would see people, they would radio it to the Border Patrol. There were agents on the U.S. side along the riverbank, and we reported some in. We went down, turned off the engine and sat there for an hour or so.

Finally, the U.S. Border Patrol asked if we would go back to the dock because those people that we had been watching, they were watching with their technology, and they weren't going to move. They knew our boats were there somewhere in the area, and so our boat went back.

I thought that meant they were saying they know you are in the area so they are not going to make a move. We can't catch them redhanded until you make a move. I thought that meant they would interdict and protect the homeland. No. Homeland security doesn't protect the homeland. No. What they were saying is: We want you to get out of the way because there are people—oh, and then there were some we could see were clearly carrying stuff that was probably drugs. There were only two or three in those groups of people who were carrying drugs. There were 17 or 18 groups like that would be wanting to come across, and it didn't look like they were carrying anything, maybe they had a raft.

So it turned out we leave, and we get radio transmission from Border Patrol: Okay, all of those folks who you had spotted, they have now all come across when you left the area, and we have got all of those in the big groups. But we didn't get those who were probably bringing in drugs, but we put somebody out at an intersection. They are going to watch for them.

These people are not stupid. They knew the intersection they put them in. They weren't going through that intersection.

If I had had any idea that our boat leaving that area of the river, the Rio Grande, was going to cause President Obama's Border Patrol to not protect our homeland but to keep welcoming drug dealers, massive drugs, and lots of folks we don't know what diseases they have—we don't know if there were any terrorists in there. We don't really know who they are. They don't carry proper identification. I have seen that time and time and time again on our border in the middle of the night. They are not carrying.

I watched two guys. They looked at their own little xeroxed piece of paper they use for identification, and if they didn't like it, they switched.

What kind of identification is that?

It is a little piece of paper, it had some English on it, and they switched. They didn't like the identity they were bringing in. We don't know who these people were.

So it will be nice come next year to know that our Border Patrol—and they are frustrated, I know. Most of them really have wanted to do their jobs. I hear from them. They are so tired of watching their homeland be assaulted. It just goes on and on, a wave every night, and we are not protecting our homeland.

We are supposed to protect this place against all enemies foreign and domestic. Some of those folks aren't enemies. They want to come in for jobs. Some want to come in for welfare. Some want to come in for food stamps. Some want to come in, but they have made commitments through the drug cartels that pay the coyotes to bring them across.

I have been out there at night when they have said: Well, no, I didn't have

\$7,000, but they are going to let me work it off in the city I am going to.

How do they work it off in those cities for the drug cartels?

They help them spread poison to American young people. They are bringing poison into our country. They come in with good motivation—wanting jobs, wanting a better life. Yet we have allowed such a massive insurgence into this country. We need to take some kind of pause and kind of figure out who in the world is in this country. We know from FBI Director Comey—such as his testimony is worth—that there are terrorist cells in every State, and that they are investigating every State. So we need to figure out who all have we let in here. In the last 8 years—and, yes, it was going on during the Bush administration, but nothing like it has just amassed in the last 8 years. We have to figure out who is here. Even this administration had no idea who they have let in.

Then when you see the article that indicates that the number of those wrongly given citizenship is much higher than initially reported—and this is from Jake Tapper with CNN—that the number of individuals who were supposed to have been deported but instead were granted citizenship is far higher than was initially reported by the media covering homeland security. This is from September: "On Monday, the Inspector General reported that 858 individuals from 'special interest countries'—meaning countries that are considered to be 'of concern to the national security of the United States'—were supposed to have been deported but were instead granted U.S. citizenship.

"But the truth is the report is even worse than reported, with more than 1,800 individuals naturalized who should have been deported from the country.

"A reason for the underplaying of the number may have been the report's focus, which was whether the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services was using digital fingerprints effectively."

So it goes on to say that there might be 1,000 more—953 more—that they didn't realize they were supposed to deport because they are probably going to kill people and create havoc here. With all the rhetoric we have heard over and over, we don't need a fence, we don't need a wall, this campaign you don't need any fence or wall down on our border.

WikiLeaks—and who knows where this stuff is coming from, but I never did hear outright denials to: Well, we are not sure where that is coming from.

Yeah, but they are saying this was your email. Did you send this email?

I just didn't hear people denying the facts that were in what was released.

Anyway, they leaked an internal memo from Barack Obama's 2008 campaign, and it made very clear that then-Senator Obama believed that fencing at the U.S.-Mexico border

could help cut down on illegal immigration. Of course, once he is in office, we hear his surrogate, Janet Napolitano, saying that if you build a 10-foot wall, then they will build a 12-foot ladder.

So what do they do?

They build a 10-foot fence around the White House. After she made fun of a 10-foot fence, they built a 10-foot fence to make it higher around the White House.

I ask: Does that fence work? Because if it works, then we need to have something like that down on our border. If it doesn't work, then let's remove the fence from around the White House. But the Obama administration, though they clamored that fences would do no good, made their fence even stronger, bigger, taller, and more secure around the White House.

So I know they said that fences didn't work, but their actions said pretty clearly: Yes, we know they work. That is why we are fixing ours up around the White House.

In my own home county, November was a very, very sad time. A 10-year-old little girl, Kayla, was finally found as friends around the country were texting, emailing, and praying for Kayla. They finally found 10-year-old Kayla. Our Smith County sheriff, Larry Smith, reported that Kayla's body was found in a well next to a home rented by her relative 4 days after her disappearance. The Sheriff said: "We assure you there will be no stone unturned as we enter the next phase of this investigation."

That is what they did. They arrested Gustavo Zavala-Garcia. He was in the country illegally. He had been deported for a violent crime in 2014, but because this Federal Government refused to protect the United States of America from all enemies foreign, this guy comes back in and killed Kayla. That is the charge.

We have seen this across the country. I know President-elect Trump has said he is going to do something about it, and, God help us, he needs to. In government we have a job. As an individual Christian, I am supposed to turn the other cheek; but when I am acting in the role of the government, my job is to make sure those who have religious beliefs can practice and keep their religious beliefs without worrying about some guy who has been deported five times coming in and shooting them.

If we find here in Congress that the executive branch is not doing what they should, then we cut off the money. That is what is supposed to happen. Cut off the money to those who aren't doing the job and send it over to people that are doing the job. If nobody is doing the job, then create another department and eliminate that department, and get somebody until you do protect the country.

There are so many across this country that are suffering and mourning the loss because the Federal Government did not protect them from some

immigrant who was a criminal who was deported. We don't protect our borders. They came back, they killed, raped, and pillaged yet again.

Then there are those who say: Well, let's just go ahead and do a complete amnesty.

This report is from Robert Rector, a brilliant guy from the National Academy of Sciences. He says: "The findings in the report indicate that if amnesty for illegal immigrants were enacted, the government would have to raise taxes immediately by \$1.29 trillion and put that sum into a high-yield bank account to cover future fiscal losses generated by the amnesty recipients and their children.

"To cover the future cost, each U.S. household currently paying federal income tax would have to pay, on average, an immediate lump sum of over \$15,000."

Wouldn't it be better to just enforce our borders?

Nobody lets in legally as many as we do in the United States. I don't know a single person in this Congress that is a xenophobe, whatever kind of phobe, but we want to do our job. There is an obligation to make sure that the over 1 million visas—more than any country in the world—that are handed out by your United States Government go to people that are not going to be a threat but are to be a blessing to this country.

The U.N. General Secretary—the new one that just came in—said over a year ago that the reason there is such a tiny fraction of a fraction of Christians who are being brought out of the Middle East as refugees is because they are so historically important right where they are. We have already recognized there is a genocide of Christians going on right now in the Middle East.

So what do we do with the Christians?

The government said: Well, we want to leave most of them there. We like what the U.N. says. Let's leave them over there to be wiped out in a genocide of Christians.

□ 1300

I am saying, Mr. Speaker, there will be a price to pay someday by this country for our callousness to Christians and Jews in the Middle East that have cried out for help. Instead of helping them, we have welcomed those who have tortured and created a living hell for them.

And one from September 10: "Suspect in Brutal Maryland Murder Deported Twice."

"Austin Sex Assault Suspect Previously Deported Five Times."

Then this administration has sent billions of dollars, a lot of it cash—load up those pallets, put them on a plane, and send them to our enemy Iran. And we find out there was an IAEA report indicating that Iran had continued to violate the Iran executive agreement. It is really a treaty, but the Senate never confirmed it, never ratified it, so it can be wiped out as soon as Trump

goes in. I know I saw a headline he doesn't think he will do that. I suggest he needs to do that. It was a rotten deal. There will be a lot of people in the Middle East and around the world, including America, who will die because this administration sent billions of dollars to Iran, a big hunk of it just pure cash.

This article says: "Iran Pressuring Palestinian Jihadists to Resume Terrorism Against Israel." But they didn't just do terrorism against Israel. They love to kill and do harm to Americans.

It is time we stood up to our oath and protected this place, protected our Constitution, our way of life, against all enemies, foreign and domestic. That is basically the oath I took when I went on Active Duty in the Army. We didn't know if we were going to be sent. We weren't sent anywhere. We were put on alert in 1979 when an act of war occurred in Iran, but President Carter wouldn't defend our people. He tried way too late and way too weakly to rescue.

But even a successful rescue would have told the world we don't have a leader in America that will protect the American people because, if you harm us, then we will come back and get out of your country, but we will leave you alone. I mean, this was President Carter that called Ayatollah Khomeini—the biggest radical Islamist terrorist in modern history—a man of peace when he was welcoming him to the power of an entire country and its military.

Radical Islamic caliphate had been out of business for many years, and Carter opened the box. Once Pandora's box was open, many thousands and thousands of our American military would die in the days to come because of it, not just military. But when a Taliban—radical Islamist terrorists—in Afghanistan get control of the country, there is going to be terrorism spread around the world. That is what happened. When a radical Islamic terrorist becomes the head of Iran, there is going to be terrorism spread around the world, and that happened.

Now, this: "Leaked FBI Data Reveal 7,700 Terrorist Encounters in USA in One Year; Border States Most Targeted."

But Andrew McCarthy, a dear friend, wrote a great article: "Deadliest Lie: Without 'Lone Wolf' Lie, U.S. Could Have Stopped Nearly Every Attack." As my friend Patrick Poole has said, there are no lone wolves, there are known wolves.

Each time we find out these people were on the radar of the FBI, of law enforcement, and they didn't know how to recognize a radical Islamist. So I hope and pray that, as a new administration comes in, we will finally put the Muslim Brotherhood, CAIR and any of the groups with which it works, on a terrorist watch list. Stop them from giving advice to the State Department, the White House, the Justice Department, Homeland Security. Stop allowing them to come in and review ma-

terial and tell us what we have to remove from our training material so that next time Russia says there is a Tsarnaev brother that has been radicalized and he is going to kill people, the FBI agents who want to stop terrorism will actually recognize it because they have been properly trained to do so instead of being treated with some politically correct garbage that keeps them from recognizing what a real radical Islamist is. You have got to know what they are reading. You have got to know what their beliefs are.

When I talked to the FBI agent whose material was completely eliminated for a time because, apparently, CAIR, named as a coconspirator in the Holy Land Foundation terrorism financing trial, was bothered by some of that stuff, when I asked the FBI Director at that time, Mueller, "You didn't even go to the mosques where the Tsarnaevs went and ask questions—What are they reading? What are they learning? What are they saying? How are they acting?—to determine if they had been radicalized?" they didn't know what to look for. Mueller said they did go out there, but it was in their outreach program.

Yeah, go out there and have a meal. Let's get together and be buddies, but not even investigate when the Russians tell you this guy is a radical, he is going to kill Americans.

They sent somebody out. They talked to him and talked to his mom. He said, "No, I am not a terrorist"; and Mom said, "He is a good boy, not a terrorist." And then he goes and kills people in Boston at the marathon because they didn't know what they were looking for.

It is time to get back to fulfilling our oath to the United States of America to protect this country, to get government out of the way, to create a level playing field across the country and then let people compete. Don't reward the losers. Encourage them to pick up and keep going when they fail because, like Edison, it is not a failure. You just found a way not to succeed on that, but you will find a way next time. We keep trying.

It is time to wake up, protect the people within the United States so that we can continue to be the biggest, brightest beacon of light in the world where people will want to come instead of a place that was once great, was once free, was once safe, but now countries around the world have travel alerts out on our cities because we are not safe anymore. It is time to protect America and put America first, which is our oath and obligation. When we do that, we can do more good for the world than we have done since World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

STATEHOOD FOR THE DISTRICT
OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to say that my colleague from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), who spoke just before me, mentioned a divided country and used a metaphor—I hope it will become a metaphor—for the coming Congress of the African American coach who coached a White team and seemed to be able to reconcile people. If this Congress doesn't learn the art of compromise, even though my Republican colleagues have captured the reins of government, they will still have trouble, without thoughtful compromise, getting matters through the House and the Senate. So I endorse the metaphor—that is what Mr. GOHMERT meant—of Coach Williams as the kind of Congress we should be beginning in January if we want to override the last several Congresses which got very little done. It will take more than bringing all the reins of government under one party to get that done.

I come to the floor this afternoon particularly to offer some background to new Members of Congress—but, I must say, to current Members of Congress as well—because there seems to me to be great mystery concerning what role Members of Congress should play when matters affecting a jurisdiction, not their own, come before them in this House. They know for sure that their own constituents didn't send them here to legislate for somebody else's district, so how come and what does it mean and how can we get on with the business of the Nation?

On November 8, the residents of the District of Columbia in an over-the-top 85 percent majority—with support, by the way, from our Republican Party in the District—passed a statehood referendum to petition the Congress for statehood for the District of Columbia. I don't think they did so because they thought that either a Democratic President or a Republican President, a Democratic Congress, would move quickly on a statehood bill, but it does express frustration that I believe my colleagues would identify with at not being treated as the full-fledged American citizens they are. On November 8, not only was I running for Congress and many of my colleagues—or most of my colleagues—the District of Columbia was, in effect, running for statehood.

Now, there are three ways to become a State: you can amend the Constitution; you can have Congress pass a bill, and we have a bill pending here now; or a State can formally petition the Congress to become a State, instead of waiting for Congress to pass a bill in the ordinary course of business.

The way to petition the Congress was patterned by the State of Tennessee,

which was then a territory. In 1795, Tennessee drafted a constitution, passed a referendum, indicated what its boundaries would be, and petitioned, succeeding in becoming the 16th State of the Union.

At the same time that 85 percent of the residents of the District of Columbia passed the statehood referendum to do the same thing—I don't want to be misunderstood. Our residents have not given up on seeking any and all elements of statehood. Even before statehood is granted, statehood consists of many different elements. Indeed, almost simultaneously, indeed, before the statehood referendum, they had voted for a budget autonomy referendum. You can imagine the insult to the residents of the District of Columbia to raise \$7 billion and then have to call on somebody else for permission to spend their own money.

□ 1315

Budget autonomy has long been the priority of the District of Columbia, and every Member of this body knows that what you prize most is the control that your own jurisdiction has over its own local budget and that, no matter what we do on the Federal budget, they can't touch your budget. Yes, they add to your budget, but your budget is your budget, and our budget is our budget. Members of Congress don't look at our budget. They know they don't know how to run a big city of, going on, 700,000 people, but the budget becomes a vehicle for interfering with the business of a local jurisdiction—the District of Columbia.

Now, Congress, in the congressional resolution that is pending, has appropriated next year's budget—that is to say, the 2017 budget. At the same time, I want to alert Congress that the budget autonomy referendum I just spoke of is in effect. That has not been overturned. It has been tested in court. The Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia vacated an opinion of the district court that indicated that the budget autonomy referendum, whereby the District was giving itself autonomy over its own budget, was unconstitutional. It vacated that, so that does not stand. Instead, it sent it to the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, and the superior court considered it and upheld the Budget Autonomy Act. No appeal was filed; so the Budget Autonomy Act is still law.

It is interesting that the Federal court sent the matter to the local court. I think the Federal court was telling us something: that, when it comes to discerning what are the local powers, we ought to look first to the local courts. No appeal was filed. The Federal courts have, in effect, deferred to the local court; so the budget autonomy referendum stands as law, notwithstanding the fact that the congressional resolution does, in fact, appropriate D.C.'s budget.

So you can see how there is some attempt to come to grips with this issue

in Congress and to come to some kind of, at least, compromise, and I appreciate that. It is very hard to understand congressional opposition to autonomy, such as it is, that the District wishes over its own budget.

What the District has done in designing its own budget autonomy referendum is certainly not to give itself statehood. The referendum is a very moderate notion because the local budget would still come to the House of Representatives and to the Senate for a review period, just as all local legislation—even though almost none of it is overturned during this period—has to come here before it becomes law. Congress would continue, under the current budget autonomy referendum, to have the existing jurisdiction over the District of Columbia, and it is going to have that jurisdiction until the District of Columbia becomes the 51st State.

Budget autonomy does not interfere, as it is mapped out in the budget autonomy referendum, with the powers of the Congress. So why not say to the District: you can have control over your own budget. If we want to interfere, we can still interfere; but you don't have to bring it up here. We can interfere without your bringing it up here.

Until this Congress, actually, the District had bipartisan support for budget autonomy. The last two Republican chairmen of the committee of jurisdiction over the District, which is the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, understood—maybe precisely because they were Republicans—why budget autonomy was the very first thing a local jurisdiction ought to demand. Former Representative Thomas Davis and DARRELL ISSA fought for budget autonomy. Mr. ISSA is still in this body, as I understand it.

Representative Davis said recently: “The benefits of budget autonomy for the District are numerous, real, and much needed. There is no drawback.”

Budget autonomy means lower borrowing costs, more accurate financial projections, improved operations, and the District government will not shut down during a Federal Government shutdown. Imagine that. That is what has happened several times here because this budget has to come here even when the District of Columbia, as always, is not implicated in disagreements with the Federal Government. If it shuts down then I have to take action to make sure the District doesn't shut down with it because, in the past, it has, indeed, been shut down for no reason except the Federal Government, itself, was shut down because it couldn't agree on Federal matters.

The District has tried all conceivable ways to get some equality with other citizens. For example, the House in 2007 and the Senate in 2009 passed the House Voting Rights Act. That would have given the District a vote in the House but not in the Senate. But at least in the people's House, you would not have